



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/632,892   | 07/31/2003  | C. Bret Elzinga      | 6922.34             | 3057             |
| 7590<br>Kirton & McConkie<br>Attn: David B. Tingey<br>1800 Eagle Gate Tower<br>60 East South Temple<br>Salt Lake City, UT 84145-0120 |             |                      |                     |                  |
| 10/27/2010   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| EXAMINER   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| UTAMA, ROBERT J  |             |                      |                     |                  |
| ART UNIT   |             | PAPER NUMBER         |                     |                  |
| 3715   |             |                      |                     |                  |
| MAIL DATE  |             | DELIVERY MODE        |                     |                  |
| 10/27/2010   |             | PAPER                |                     |                  |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/632,892

**Applicant(s)**

ELZINGA ET AL.

**Examiner**

ROBERT J. UTAMA

**Art Unit**

3715

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8, 9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Proficiency's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-544)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of the application***

1. This is a response to the amendment and argument filed on 08/12/2010. The current status of the application is as follows: claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 are still pending. Claims 6-7, 10-11, 13, 38, 56, 64 and 66 have been cancelled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The specification provided fails to provide a teaching of a "... using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to selectively match the identified and prioritized portions of the educational content with the identified educational activities for presentation to the particular learner," Based on the specification citation provided by the applicant the "prioritization" seems to be based on the student's schedule instead of the student's performance data.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-5, 8-9, 14-21, 23, 25, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 39-43, 47-48, 50-52, 58-59, 61—63, 65, and 67-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085, in view of Bull US 6,409,514 and further in view of Turner US 6,633,742**

**Claims 1, 50, 58 and 61:** The Krebs reference provides a teaching of providing a method of a dynamic continual improvement education environment that is tailored to the individual learner comprising of:

using a user interface and a graphical design technique to design an educational path (see Krebs col. 12:39-45) that is selectively adaptive to educational performances of learners (see also col. 7:45-65), wherein the adaptive educational path comprises dynamic educational content and a plurality of object oriented educational activities for presentation to the learners (see col. 4:10-25 “training, simulation or a test”), wherein the dynamic educational content is separate and independent from the plurality of object oriented educational activities(see col. 3:40-45), wherein the design technique automatically produces computer readable instructions relating to the dynamic educational content (see Krebs col. 1:56-61), and wherein aspects of the educational content are associated in a relational order even when an aspect of the educational content is moved (see Krebs ‘280 col. 12:39-45, col. 5:10-22, col. 6:49-62 and FIG.2);

providing a portion of the adaptive educational path for presentation of at least a portion of the educational content to a particular learner (see col. 19:25-32);

obtaining and automatically analyzing learner performance data of the particular learner wherein the learner performance data is obtained and analyzed by a computer system (see col. 18:10-19:32);

using a computer processor and a computer readable medium encoded with object oriented computer executable code to automatically and adaptively customize the educational path to an educational performance of the particular learner (see col. 4:25-60);

The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching of selectively matching the identified portions of the educational content with identified educational activities for presentation to the particular learner. However, the Turner reference provides a teaching of identifying which portions of the educational content and the educational activities are to be combined and presented with to the learner based upon the learner performance data obtained and analyzed by the system (see Turner col. 18:30-49). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of teaching of selectively matching the identified portions of the educational content with identified educational activities for presentation to the particular learner, as taught by Turner in order to insure that the learner is exposed with the proper learning material (see Abstract).

The Krebs reference fail to provide a teaching of using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to identifying which portions of the educational content are to be presented to the particular learner wherein the identified portions include a type and difficulty of the educational content that is to be selectively presented to the particular learner;

using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to selectively determine a frequency of exposure of the identified portions of the educational content to the particular learner;

using learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to identify which of the object oriented activities are to be presented to the particular learner

using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer

system to identify which of the object oriented educational activities are to be presented to the particular learner;

selectively sequencing the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities for presentation to the particular learner based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system, wherein the sequencing comprises modifying the presentation order of the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed; and

providing portions of the educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of time based on at least some of the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to maintain the learner's understanding of the educational content.

However, the Parry reference provides a teaching of using learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to identify which portions of the educational content are to be presented with to particular the learner (see col. 10:55-60) wherein the identified portions include a type and difficulty of the educational content is selectively presented to the particular learner (see Parry col. 6:35-60 "type and difficult "for the question to be presented );

using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to selectively determine a frequency of exposure of the identified portions of the educational content to the particular learner (see Parry col. 15:15-20);

and

providing portions of the educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of time based on at least some of the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to maintain the learner's understanding of the educational content (see col. 20:15-25).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of providing portions of the educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of time based on at least some of the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to maintain the learner's understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

The Bull reference provides a teaching of using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to identify prioritize the identified portions of the oriented educational activities content that are to be presented to the particular learner (see col. 6:35-43). ;

using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to selectively matching selectively match the identified and prioritized portions of the educational content with the identified educational activities for presentation to the particular learner (see col. 5:55-65); and

selectively sequencing prioritizing the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities for presentation to the particular learner based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system, wherein the sequencing prioritization comprises modifying the presentation order of the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed (see col. 7:30-45),

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to identify prioritize the identified portions of the oriented educational activities content that are to be

presented to the particular learner; using the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system to selectively matching selectively match the identified and prioritized portions of the educational content with the identified educational activities for presentation to the particular learner and selectively sequencing prioritizing the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities for presentation to the particular learner based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed by the computer system, wherein the sequencing prioritization comprises modifying the presentation order of the individually matched educational content and corresponding educational activities based upon the learner performance data that was obtained and analyzed; as taught by Bull, in order to provide the most optimum presentation schedule for the student.

**Claims 2, 51, 59 and 62:** The Krebs reference provides a teaching of adaptive sequencing is ordered based upon a characteristic particular user, said characteristic is at least one of the learning progress of the user (see Krebs col. 19:55-32 “test score” being used to marked which learning object vertex to be shown).

**Claims 3, 5 and 20:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching of presentation of a portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review are based on user's performance and where the performance are correspond to user's speed or accuracy. However, the Parry '085 reference provide a teaching where the presentation of a portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review are based on user's performance and where the performance are correspond to user's speed or accuracy (see Parry '085 abstract and col. 2:65 – 3:2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner



understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 4:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching of portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review is based on minimum and maximum delay of the review and such parameters are selectively adjustable by the designer. However, the Parry '085 provide a teaching where the presentation of a portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review is based on minimum and maximum delay of the review and such parameters are selectively adjustable by the designer (see Parry '085 abstract and col.2:65 – 3:2). Parry et al also provide a teaching where the delay in the spaced review method is based on a maximum (several days) or minimum delay (1 day) [see Parry '085 col. 20:19-22]. It is not known if these parameters are adjustable by the designer. However, the examiner takes the position that the determination of such parameter would always reside on the hand of a designer, as some one is required to put some initial parameter in the system. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claims 8-9:** Krebs provides a teaching where the design technique comprise of a drag-and-drop technique that graphically relates components of the educational component and association comprises of linking available components of the educational content based on specific properties of the component (Krebs '280 col.14:4-11). Krebs also provides a teaching of modifying properties of the available component (Krebs '280 col. 13:60-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the features of a drag-and-drop technique that graphically relates

components of the educational component, association comprises of linking available components of the educational content based on specific properties of the component and modifying properties of the available component into the system of Parry '085 because it would enable the author to design a course in an intuitive straightforward manner (Krebs col. 1:48-53).

**Claims 14 and 15:** Krebs fails to provide a teaching where the adaptive educational path provides an order for concepts to be learn by the user [Claim 14] and the path comprises of a linear sequence of activity [Claim 15] (see Krebs col. 6:50-60).

**Claim 16:** Krebs provides a teaching where a flow educational activity includes one or more stage marker (new stage, test stage) that delineates meaningful stages of learning (col. 6:55 "Basic concepts").

**Claims 17 and 68:** Parry and Krebs fail to provide a teaching of automatically snapping activity icons to a grid.

The examiner's previous statement that the feature of automatically snapping activity icons to a grid as being old and well known in the art of document processing and design has been taken to be admitted prior art (see previous office action). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the feature of automatically snapping activity icons to a grid into the system of Parry and Krebs since it would allow the author design in a fluid manner.

**Claims 18 and 67:** Krebs provides a teaching where the step of using an interface and graphical design technique to design an adaptive educational path further comprises of selectively organizing the activating icons into a flow of activities (Krebs '280 col. 12:39-45 and FIG. 11).

**Claims 19 and 69:** Krebs '280 provides a teaching of graphical user interface that is used to describe the flow of a course activity (see Krebs '280 FIG. 11 item labeled as "knowledge unit" and col. 2:55-3:15). These knowledge units contain other activities that branch to other learning material (see Krebs '280 FIG. 2 and col. 4:25-34), that would maintain their relationship when they are moved (col. 4:59-63).

**Claims 21 and 43:** Krebs fails to provide a teaching of for designing an averment that includes a look and feel that is customized to a particular audience. Parry '085 provides a teaching for designing an environment that includes a look and feel that is customized to a particular audience (e.g. via videodisc or audio recording) (see 3:36-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 23:** Krebs fails to provide a teaching of an interface and design technique that automatically analyzes data to identify the association. Parry '085 provide a teaching for an interface and design technique to automatically analyzes data to identify the association (Parry col. 6:59-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 25:** The Krebs provides an explicit teaching of designing a lesson via the use of a GUI (see Krebs col. 12:39-45).

**Claim 27:** Krebs fails to provide a teaching of identifying the current activity of a user Parry '085 provide a teaching automatically identifying the current activity of the user, keeping track of the user's learning progress and automatically determine the next activity to the user (see Parry '085 abstract, col. 3:25-30, col. 3:60-67 and FIG. 15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 28:** The Krebs reference provides a teaching where the end of the activity the system will make a decision to present the next material or provide lesson. Parry '085 provide a teaching of upon the end of an activity the system will make a decision (or branch) whether to present next material or provide review lessons (col. 3:2-9 and col. 18:51-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claims 29 and 33:** The Krebs reference of automatically identifying the current activity of the user providing assistance and another adaptive path if the material is understood. Parry '085 provide a teaching automatically identifying the current activity of the user, providing assistance if the material is not understood, and providing another adaptive path if the material is understood (see Parry '085 abstract, col. 3:2-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner

understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claims 34 and 48:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching of where the frequency of the presentation of certain material is modified based on the learning rate of the student. However, the Parry '085 provides a teaching where the frequency of the presentation of certain educational material is modified based on the learning rate of the student [**Claim 34**] (Parry '085 col. 3:1-10). Materials that are deemed to be difficult are given more priorities (shown more) and materials that are deemed to be mastered are given fewer priorities (shown less) [**Claim 48**] (see Parry col.3:9-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claims 31 and 47:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching where the system record and report a user's progress. However, the Parry '085 provides a teaching where the system records and reports a user's progress (col. 10:58-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 37:** Krebs '280 provides a teaching where the lesson objects also have a hierarchical order (see Krebs 280 fig. 11).

**Claims 39 and 40:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching of allowing the designer to determine the type of information to be tracked and one of that information being a time period. Parry '085 provide teachings where the designer is allowed to determined the type information to be tracked and one of those information is the time period (col. 2:65-col.3:2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the leaner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 41:** Krebs '280 provides a teaching where the component module is tagged using metadata such that these components are re-usable for creating other learning objects (col. 4:53-67).

**Claim 42:** Krebs '280 provides a teaching where the knowledge unit to be represented by various electronic output layout format (col. 4:25-34).

**Claim 52:** Krebs '289 provides a teaching where the graphical user interface is used to design an adaptive educational path, where different learning strategies have it own path (Krebs '280 col. 2:50-55).

**Claim 63:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching where the presentation of a portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review. Parry '085 provides a teaching where the presentation of a portion of presentation of the user composed of a step to provide systematic spaced review (see Parry '085 abstract and col.2:65 – 3:2). The spaced review parameters are controlled at least by the user accuracy or speed of understanding (see Parry '085 abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the leaner

understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

**Claim 65:** The Krebs reference fails to provide a teaching that the relational association is between components of educational content and is based on specific topic and subtopic. However, the Parry '085 provide a teaching that the relational association is between components of educational content and is based on specific topic and subtopic (see Parry '085 sub-topic and orientation col. 11:45-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of educational content for iterative presentation to the learner over an extended period of the time to maintain the learner understanding of the educational content, as taught by Parry, in order to insure that the user is familiar with the newly learned concept (see col. 2:60-68).

6. **Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085, in view of Turner US 6,663,742, in view of Bull US 6,409,514 and further in view of Jensen US 6,834,276.**

**Claim 22:** The Krebs reference provides a teaching of graphically associating educational concept types with relationship types and properties (see FIG 3 col. 6:45-55); automatically add new educational content from outside resources (see col. 11:50-65); selectively tag education portions of a particular lessons to illustrate to the particular learner different contextual uses of the educations portions (see FIG 9 and col. 11:45-65). The Krebs reference lack teaching for the feature of selectively cutting an audio files into a smaller files that are named and preserved; modifying the start and end position of a selected audio files; utilizing repository media for designing the educational content and graphically identifying potential presentation problem corresponding to the educational content. However, the Gleissner reference provides a teaching of selectively cutting an audio files into a smaller files that are named and preserved

(see paragraph 50-51); modifying the start and end position of a selected audio files (see paragraph 60-62) and utilizing repository media for designing the educational content (see paragraph 18-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to include the feature of teaching of selectively cutting an audio files into a smaller files that are named and preserved modifying the start and end position of a selected audio files and utilizing repository media for designing the educational content, in view of Gleissner, in order to insert multimedia presentation to the learning content (see paragraph 4-5).

The Jensen reference provides a teaching of graphically identifying potential presentation problem corresponding to the educational content (see Jensen col. 21:45-65). Thus it would have been recognized by one of ordinary skilled in the art that applying the known technique taught by Jensen into the course editor of Krebs would have yielded predictable results and resulted in an improved system, namely, a system that would be able to inform the user if certain files or part of the database is corrupted and needed repair (see col. 21:60-65).

7.

8. **Claims 24, 26, 60 and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085, in view of Bull US 6,409,514 and further in view of Turner US 6,633,742 and further in view of Kershaw 5,565,316**

**Claims 24, 26, 60 and 70:** Parry and Krebs fails to provide a teaching where automated test are executed to ensure that components function as designed and diagnosing errors in the components [**Claim 24, 60, 70**] and detecting any potential problem for repair [**Claim 26**]. However, Kershaw '316 provides a teaching of having a quality assurance test, which can diagnose error and detect any potential problem for repair (Col.28:4-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the feature of having a quality assurance test which can diagnose



error and detect any potential problem for repair, as taught by Kershaw '316, in order to assure the quality of the test component.

9. **Claims 30 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085, in view of Bull US 6,409,514 and further in view of Turner US 6,633,742 and further in view of Jenkins US 6, 293,801.**

**Claims 30 and 49:** Parry and Krebs fails to provide a teaching where the system automatically provides positive feedback to the user.

Jenkins 801 provides a teaching where the user is given a positive feedback (col. 3:14-28).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the feature of giving a positive feedback to the user of the system, as taught by Jenkins, into the system of **Parry** in order to indicate and award user for giving a correct response.

10. **Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085 and further in view of Turner US 6,633,742 and further in view of Strub et al 6,652,287**

**Claim 32:** Parry and Krebs fails to provide a teaching of ensuring that the presentation performed as intended by the designer and that the result of the presentation is reliable.

Strub 287 provide a teaching where the system measures the presentation to ensure that it performed as intended and the result of the presentation is reliable (see Krebs '287 FIG. 12, 13 and col. 12:30-45). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include the feature of ensuring that the presentation performed as intended by the designer and that the result of the presentation is reliable, as taught by Strub 287, into the system of Parry '085 because it would ensure the instructor/designer to react to students' concern or difficulties (Strub col. 15:15-20).

11. **Claims 35-36 and 44-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Krebs US 7,029,280, in view of Parry US 6,077,085, in view of Turner US 6,633,742, in view of Bull US 6,409,514 and further in view of Siefert 5,810,605.**

**Claims 35-36 and 44-46:** Parry and Krebs fails to provide a teaching where the step of evaluating the educational content includes of automatically conducting0 experiment to identify instructional setting for the user [Claim 35, 45 and 46], determine information relating to one or more group to which the user belongs [claim 44] and automatically analyzes the data gathered from the experiment [Claim 36].

Siefert '605 provide a teaching where the system conducts experiment and automatically evaluating the data obtain from the experiment to ascertain which settings will be acceptable to the user [claim 35,36 and 44-45] and to determine information relating to one or more group to which the user belongs -left brain or right brain thinker- [Claim 44] (Siefert '605 col. 3:31-4:7). These setting are based upon the type of learner the student is classified as [Claim 46]. Therefore it would have been obvious to include the feature of automatically evaluating the data obtain from the experiment to ascertain which settings will be acceptable to the user, as taught by Siefert '605, to the system of Parry and Krebs because it would enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of the system with respect to a user (Siefert '605 col. 2:47-59).

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 8-9, 12, 14-37, 39-55, 57-63, 65 and 67-70 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROBERT J. UTAMA whose telephone number is (571)272-1676. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5:30 Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. J. U./  
Examiner, Art Unit 3715

/XUAN M. THAI/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715

